m-5

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,944	08/26/2003	Charles S. Lail JR.	CM05520J	4083

7590 09/26/2006

Barbara R. Doutre
Motorola, Inc.
Law Department
8000 West Sunrise Boulevard
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33322

EXAMINER	
PHU, SANH D	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2618	

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/648,944	LAIL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sanh D. Phu	2618	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 August 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *6-14,17-20* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-5,15 and 21-25* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *16* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *8/26/03*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The IDS filed 8/26/2003 has been considered and recorded in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cannon et al (6,445,936).

Regarding to claim 1, Cannon et al disclose an automatic keypad lockout system (116, 118, 154)(see Fig. 1), comprising:

a portable communication device (100) having a keypad (118);

an accessory (cradle, 110) for receiving the portable communication device (100); and

a means (122) for detecting insertion and removal of the portable communication device into and out of the accessory so as to enable and disable the keypad (see Fig. Col. 5, lines 49-67).

Regarding to claims 2 and 3, Cannon et al disclose the automatic keypad lockout system wherein the means for detecting is selected from one of magnetic, electrical, optical, and mechanical implementations (detecting an electrical signal by physical switch on/off hook)(see col. 5, lines 6-9).

a magnetic switch within the device; and a corresponding magnet within the accessory for opening and closing the switch (detecting an electrical signal by physical switch on/off hook)(see col. 5, lines 6-9).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 4, 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cannon et al.

Regarding to claims 4 and 5, cannon et al disclose the system wherein the switch hook is off when the portable communication device is outside of the accessory thereby enabling the keypad; and the switch hook is on when the device inserted into the accessory thereby disabling the keypad (see col. 5, lines 6-9, lines 46-49, cannon et al describe using a physical switch hook to detect current of the handset in/off cradle in order to able/disable the keypad).

Cannon et al fails to disclose using the reed switch with the coil to generate magnetic field in order to closes/opens (or Off/ON) the switch as claimed. However, the Examiner takes Official Notice that using the reed momentary (with normally closed/opened) switch/relay is known in the art to use it for cutting Off/turning On a circuit by controlling the enable-pin. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art of the invention to modify Cannon et al as claimed, in order to have different ways of switching to be set by normally closes/opens mode.

6. Claims 15, 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cannon et al in view of Kostiainen et al (2004/0203499).

Regarding to claims 15 and 21, Cannon et al fails to disclose the automatic keypad lockout system further comprising:

a unique ID stored in the accessory, the unique ID associated with a predetermined user configuration; and

the portable communication device reading the unique ID from the accessory and assuming the predetermined configuration associated with that ID.

Kostiainen et al disclose the automatic keypad lockout system (with the accessory is keypad cover) comprising:

a unique ID stored in the accessory, the unique ID associated with a predetermined user configuration (Fig.1 and Fig.4 and text portion); and

the portable communication device reading the unique ID from the accessory and assuming the predetermined configuration associated with that ID (Fig.1 and Fig.4 and text portion);

further comprising: an alterable ID stored in the accessory (variable resistor values with different modes, table 2) ; and

the portable communication device reading the alterable ID from the accessory and assuming predetermined personal settings associated with that alterable ID (see table 2 and Fig. 8, section [0038]-[0053]) .

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art of the invention was made to implement Cannon et al's ID detection circuit, as taught by Kostiainen et al, in order to identify the correct type of the handsets.

Regarding to claim 22, Cannon et al disclose an automatic keypad lockout system (116,118,122)(see Fig. 1), comprising:

a portable electronic device having a keypad (118);

an accessory (110) with which to couple the portable electronic device (100)(Fig. 1);

the portable electronic device disabling the keypad when coupled to the accessory and enabling the keypad when not coupled to the accessory (see Fig. 1) (see Fig. Col. 5, lines 49-67);

Cannon et fails to disclose an ID stored in the accessory; and the portable electronic the device, when coupled to the accessory, reading the ID and assuming a predetermined configuration associated with that ID until the portable communication device is coupled to another accessory containing a different ID.

Kostiainen et al disclose an ID stored in the accessory; and the portable electronic the device, when coupled to the accessory, reading the ID and assuming a predetermined configuration associated with that ID until the portable communication device is coupled to another accessory containing a different ID (see table 2 and Fig. 8, section [0038]-[0053]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art of the invention was made to implement Cannon et al's ID detection circuit, as taught by Kostiainen et al, in order to identify the correct type of the handsets.

Regarding to claim 23, claim 23 is rejected with similar reason as set forth in claim 21.

Regarding to claim 24, Kostiainen et al disclose the portable electronic device (1), when coupled to the accessory (25), reads a current configuration of

the alterable ID and assumes a predetermined personalized setting associated with that ID (see table 2 and Fig. 8, section [0038]-[0053]).

Regarding to claim 25, Cannon et al disclose a communication system, comprising:

a portable electronic device having a keypad (118)(Fig. 1);

Cannon fails to disclose a plurality of accessories with which to couple to the portable electronic device, a unique ID stored in each of the plurality of accessories;

the portable electronic device disabling the keypad when coupled to any of the plurality of accessories and enabling the keypad when not coupled to any of the plurality of accessories; and

the portable electronic the device, when coupled to the accessory, reading the unique ID and assuming the predetermined configuration associated with that ID.

Kostiainen et al disclose a plurality of accessories (manu types of covers with different ID) with which to couple to the portable electronic device (1), a

unique ID stored in each of the plurality of accessories (see table 2 and Fig. 8, section [0035]-[0053]);

the portable electronic device disabling the keypad when coupled to any of the plurality of accessories and enabling the keypad when not coupled to any of the plurality of accessories (see table 2 and Fig. 8, section [0035]-[0053]); and

the portable electronic the device, when coupled to the accessory, reading the unique ID and assuming the predetermined configuration associated with that ID (see table 2 and Fig. 8, section [0035]-[0053]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art of the invention was made to implement Cannon et al's ID detection circuit, as taught by Kostiainen et al, in order to identify correct the type of the handsets.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claim 16 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Regarding to claim 16, the prior art of record fails to teach the automatic keypad lockout system further comprising:

a plurality of reed switches embedded in the device; and

an array of magnets embedded in the accessory for aligning and mating with at least one of the plurality of reed switches forming a predefined pattern corresponding to the unique ID.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sanh D. Phu whose telephone number is (571)272-7857. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th from 7:00-17:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew D. Anderson can be reached on (571) 272-4177. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Sanh D. Phu
Examiner
Division 2618

SP

9/18/06

SANH D. PHU
PATENT EXAMINER